

From: Rofo, John S. (Dr.)
Sent: 20 November 2009 18:36
To: 'kevin galalae'
Cc: Galalae, Kevin M.C.
Subject:

Dear Kevin,

I hope this finds you well. As I stated yesterday I write in following up the matters you raised in your email of 14.46 19 November . As you will appreciate I have given a great deal of thought to the matter and want to make clear the policy and processes involved in assessment of e-tivities.

It is our stated policy that e-tivities 2 and 3 are first marked by the Associate Tutor and then moderated: e-tivity 4 is first marked by the module convenor with the Associate Tutor providing the second marking. The moderation of these e-tivities, and those across the different modules was undertaken by myself at the time they were submitted and feedback provided.

I found the application of the marking criteria, which can be found in the IRDL Blackboard site, for your group as with all of the others was in line with the requirements of the position of Associate Tutor. This reflected the careful selection and training we undertake of our Associate Tutors.

I have revisited your e-tivities: 4/5 for e-tivity 3 is a very good mark – 80% which would see you well in the distinction bracket. Equally I am sure you would be disappointed with you e-tivity 4 mark, but there is a clear rationale provided by the feedback from the first marker for this, which if you rectify would mean a good essay mark is still very much in your grasp.

There is every possibility that with a strong essay, addressing the points raised in your feedback, you could still achieve a distinction level mark for the module.

I would urge you to consider your position carefully with regard to remaining on our programme, as it is clear you have much to say on many of the important issues of the course.

With my best wishes,
Simon

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 19 November 2009 14:46
To: Dr. Rofo Leicester
Subject: RE:

Dear Dr. Rofo,

Social and business engagements have prevented me from getting back to you yesterday, which I very much wanted to given the time and effort you have dedicated to this issue and your prompt response.

Before I can address your well considered email point by point I need to know what your opinion is on the way my last two e-tivities have been marked. The impartiality of your answer will have a great bearing on my impending decision to stay in or leave the programme.

I am of the opinion that they reflect Nick's biases more than the actual value of my work. I include the marked e-tivities as attachments and the correspondence (from last to first) between Nick and me on the evaluation of e-tivity 3 (see below) to aid you in understanding the issue.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Kevin Galalae

Re: Resubmission of e-tivity 3

Dear Kevin,

First of all I would like to re-iterate that the score you received for e-tivity 3 - 4/5 - was very good and demonstrated high quality work on your part. That said, I have reviewed the instructions for this e-tivity and am satisfied that they are clear about what is required. Resubmission will therefore not be possible.

Best wishes,

Nick

From: kevin galalae [kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 10 November 2009 15:30
To: Nick Wright
Subject: RE:

Hi Nick,
If that is the case, can I resubmit my essay? Afterall, the misunderstanding is partly due to the lack of clear direction in the e-tivity text. It seems unfair to me that I should alone burden the consequences.
Kevin

From: nw78@leicester.ac.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
Date: Tue, 10 Nov 2009 14:54:27 +0000
Subject: RE: RE:

Hi Kevin,

Thanks for your message - the title of e-tivity 3 is "Text Critique I" and so it is assumed that this will be the basis on which students approach the analysis.

Best,

Nick

From: kevin galalae [kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 10 November 2009 14:30
To: Nick Wright
Subject: RE:

Hi Nick,

Sorry for being unclear. My query was not about the length but about having to critique the article. The e-tivity instructions do not say anything about having to critique the article. It requires only that we analyse it. Your comments on my e-tivity seem to indicate that the reason I did not receive full marks (and was only given 80%) is because I did not also critique Huntington's article within the allotted 400 word limit. Having read and re-read the e-tivity 3 instructions I cannot see any mention of critique but only the requirement that we analyse. That is why my 400 page analysis is only that, an analysis, and my subsequent postings include my critique. In this regard you wrote:

Text critique - a good summary of Huntington's key points and you demonstrate here and in your subsequent postings an excellent understanding of what he is arguing. I would like to have seen more critical engagement with the article, however.

Dialogue with Group

It is a shame that the critique of Huntington came here and not in the original posting,

I would greatly appreciate elucidation on whether we also needed to critique and not just analyse the articles we chose. For if that is the case, I totally misunderstood the task and the absence of any requirement that we critique in the e-tivity instructions is to blame for this and not my lack of trying or of ability.

Warm regards,

Kevin Galalae

From: nw78@leicester.ac.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
Date: Tue, 10 Nov 2009 09:32:59 +0000
Subject: RE:

Hi Kevin,

I've got to my computer and have had a look at the instructions for e-tivities 3 and 5 on Blackboard.

The parameters of each e-tivity are set out in four sections: purpose, task, respond and outcome. The bit you referred to below is the purpose, but below it you will see task, including word limits. E-tivity 5 again has a 400 word maximum.

Hope this helps.

Nick

From: kevin galalae [kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 09 November 2009 21:46
To: Nick Wright
Subject:

Hi Nick,

In relation to e-tivity 3, I forgot to mention that I was unaware we had to also critique the article we were tasked to analyse in 400 words. Given that Huntington's article is 29 pages long and very dense, even if I had known I would not have been able to squeeze a meaningful analysis and critique in 400 words. My critique came in my subsequent postings. The e-tivity 3 page says only that we are "Analyse ONE of the following [articles] and identify its major attributes."

To prevent this from occurring again I would like to make sure that e-tivity 5 does not require us to critique the article as well as analyse it. The e-tivity 5 page says only that we are "To analyse a well-known article and identify its major attributes." Please let me know.

Thank you.

Warm regards,

Kevin Galalae

From: jsr13@leicester.ac.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
CC: kmcg1@leicester.ac.uk
Date: Wed, 18 Nov 2009 19:56:52 +0000
Subject: RE: RE:

Dear Kevin,

Thank you for your email. May I begin by stating that I have taken a great deal of time to contemplate the scenario we find ourselves in since reviewing the message board yesterday evening and my initial email to you at 1922 last evening. Throughout the day I have pondered this, while seeking advice from colleagues across the University throughout the day. What follows is my considered response to the scenario which provides for a constructive solution, and allows all parties to move on with the completion of the module and ultimately your degree.

The first point in response to your request for an “adequate formulation” below, is that the whole matter should not have been played out on the forum. If at any point you had concerns over the way the forums were being operated you should have approached your Associate Tutor directly. If you were then unsatisfied with the response, or felt unable to raise the matter with them, you should have approached me as your Personal Tutor, and I would happily have investigated the matter. That is part of the role of the Personal Tutor as explained in an email I sent during the first week of the module. Further, as Director of DL any issues that arise I want to be kept abreast of issues pertaining to student engagement and so would have welcomed your correspondence. Playing this out in public is unhelpful, not because of any personal upset, but because it has skewed this week’s forum.

Further, you have been given the opportunity to edit the tone of your posts and have chosen not to do that.

Simply put, in my opinion, your Associate Tutor has not disparaged your intellectual abilities, and you have neglected the opportunity to change your remarks.

Then your post this afternoon 1300 suggesting that your Associate Tutor’s post was an ‘act of censorship’ was equally unhelpful. I cannot help ponder why you would consider their remarks suspicious. That you and I may disagree, doesn’t mean we need to be suspicious of each other. There is no need to be suspicious of the Associate Tutor’s remarks: or my remarks here. That your remarks remain would suggest an absence of censorship.

In essence, the “direction” of which you speak in your post of 1858 this evening should not be needed in these matters. Appreciating when matters have reached their natural conclusion is, as suggested in my mail of yesterday evening, something that we need to work towards mastering.

That you are ‘at a loss’, provides a good opportunity for pause and reflection I suggest, to ensure we avoid the time and effort devoted to this correspondence in the past 24 hours and instead focus upon the learning we wish to undertake in this subject.

As your Personal Tutor, and as Director of DL, I will be glad to hear of anything else you have to say. Equally, I look forward to discussion of the variety that typified the early weeks of the class, and correspondence that reflected our earlier conversation about brevity.

With my best wishes,
Simon

From: kevin galalae [mailto:kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 17 November 2009 22:52
To: Dr. Rofe Leicester
Subject: RE:

Dear Dr. Rofe,
I am at a loss. Frankly I do not know how I could possibly address the issue of Nick's disparagement of my intellectual abilities more respectfully than I have already done. Can you please suggest what you would consider an adequate formulation!
Sincerely,
Kevin

From: jsr13@leicester.ac.uk
To: kgalalae@hotmail.com
CC: kmcg1@leicester.ac.uk
Date: Tue, 17 Nov 2009 22:40:13 +0000
Subject: RE:

Dear Kevin,

thank you for your prompt response. I have looked on the board and from what I can see you have removed the final section of the last sentence.

This does not wholly address my previous email's concerns. The post's tone has not changed. I would ask that you return to it and address its potentially 'threatening' tone.

Further, I'm afraid I myself am puzzled by your suggestion of discrepancy. I don't read it that way. The role of the Associate Tutor (AT) is to "encourage students to engage with one another through the online discussion forums; Promote and instigate student participation". This is what Nick has been doing; in many regard he has gone above and beyond the call of duty and has at times no doubt play devil's advocate to 'promote and instigate student participation'. That the message boards for his group are by far and away the busiest of the 9 currently operating is to his credit on this level (your total posts for the weekly forums is 260, the next busiest weekly forums board has just over a hundred). You may not agree with his views, you are entitled of course, but I would ask you respect the role of AT.

With my best wishes.
Simon

From: kevin galalae [kgalalae@hotmail.com]
Sent: 17 November 2009 22:10

To: Dr. Rofe Leicester

Subject:

Dear Dr. Rofe,

I hope you find my amendment satisfactory.

It puzzles me however that you have not identified a discrepancy in Nick's demands for evidence when opinions he disagrees with are presented while he makes no such demands for evidence when opinions he agrees with are presented.

Kevin